

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

REMARKS

The outstanding Office Action mailed 5 January 2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 6-8, 10, 16-18, 20, 26-28 and 30 are pending. Applicants wish to point out an apparent discrepancy in the Office Action with regard to claim 18. Specifically, in the Office Action Summary, claim 18 was not listed as pending, nor was claim 18 listed in paragraph 2, page 2, as being one of the claims presented for examination. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is pending.

Please enter the foregoing amendments to claims 6, 8, 10, 18, 20, and 30. Applicants believe that no new matter is introduced by way of these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 19, 21-25, and 29 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to file the canceled claims in a continuation or divisional application. Claims 6, 8, 17, 18, 20, and 30 have been amended to correct informalities. The remaining claims are either allowable or depend from amended claims that are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-8, 10, 16-18, 20, 26-28 and 30 are now ready for allowance.

Amendments to the Claims

The Office Action alleged that claims 6, 10, 17, 20, and 30 included limitations that lacked sufficient antecedent basis.

With regards to claim 6, it was alleged that claim 6 lacked antecedent basis for "the first

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

web site," "the user interface in the web site," and "the already open web site." Applicants have amended claim 6 to provide for antecedent basis for "the first web site." In addition, the phrase "the user interface in the web site comprises" has been amended to recite "the first web site includes the web site user interface, the web site user interface comprises." Applicants respectfully submit that line 10 of the pending claim 6 correctly recites "an already open web site."

With regard to claim 8, which depends from claim 6, claim 8 was amended to change "an already open web site" to "the already open web site," which has antecedent basis support in claim 6.

With regard to claim 10, Applicants have amended claim 10 at line 6 to recite the phrase "a first web site" and at line 14 to recite the phrase "a second web site's URL," thereby providing sufficient antecedent basis for the phrases "the first web site" and "the second web site's URL."

With regard to claims 17 and 18, it was alleged that claim 17 lacked sufficient antecedent basis for the phrases "the first web site" and "the address book application." Applicants respectfully submit that the phrase "the first web site" is not included in claim 17, but the phrase "the first web site" was found in claim 18, which depends from claim 16. Claim 18 has been amended at line 1, to provide the antecedent support for the phrase "the first web site." Claim 17 has been amended at line 11 to recite "an address book."

Claim 20 has been amended at line 4 to include the phrase "a first web site" and at line 15 to include the phrase "a second web site's URL," thereby providing sufficient antecedent basis support for the phrases "the first web site" and "the second web site's URL."

Claim 30 has been amended to recite "a first web site," at line 4, "the first web site, which is already open," at lines 8 and 9, and "a second web site's URL," at line 15, thereby providing sufficient antecedent basis support for the phrases "the first web site," "the already open first web site."

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

Claims 6 – 8, 10, 16 – 17, 20, 26 – 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by an article entitled “Visto launches mobile communication platform,” hereinafter *Visto*.

With regards to *Visto*, the reference apparently discloses that “Powered – by – Visto is a comprehensive suite of applications that runs either wireless or wired Web – enabled devices. The applications integrate email, address book, calendar, files, and synchronize information.” (See *Visto* paragraph 7.) Wireless features “ensure that users can easily access this information anytime using any Web-enabled device. Because content is integrated directly into its applications, Visto enhances the users’ experience and makes it easier than ever to access information on the go.” (See *Visto* paragraph 8, lines 1 – 4.) For example, Visto provides “Visto’s Integrated Public Content” - “[i]nstead of getting driving directions by typing in the starting and ending addresses on a wireless device, users simply click once on a starting and ending address in their address books.” (See *Visto* paragraph 8, lines 22 – 26.) The reference further discloses that the “Powered – by – Visto platform provides carriers, businesses and websites with a rich suite of integrated communications applications enabling anytime, anywhere access to information.” (See *Visto* paragraph 9, lines 3 – 5.)

“Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *SSIH Equip. S.A. v. USITC*, 718 F.2d 365, 218 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 678 (Fed. Cir. 1983).” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose at least each and every element in the claimed inventions, and therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 6 – 8, 10, 16 – 17, 20, 26 – 27, and 30 be withdrawn. Applicants discuss the rejections and limitations of the independent claims hereinbelow. It is believed that the independent claims include patentable subject matter beyond the limitations discussed hereinbelow.

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6 is as follows:

A method for automatically transferring information from a website displayed on a handheld Internet appliance into a local database in the handheld Internet appliance, the method comprising:

 determining the information to be transferred with a web site application program interface;

 selecting a plurality of options available on a web site user interface for transferring the information from a first web site into the handheld Internet appliance, *wherein the first web site includes the web site user interface*, the web site user interface comprises a button in the first web site, the button comprising a menu displaying menu options for transferring the information from the first web site into the handheld Internet appliance, the menu options comprising: an option for saving the information from an already open web site into a local application; and a plurality of options for launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site; and

 automatically transferring the information from the web site into the local database in the handheld Internet appliance using a software plug in, the transfer performing all necessary format conversions and taking place independent from a synchronization operation. (Emphasis Added.)

Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose at least

“selecting a plurality of options available on a web site user interface for transferring the information from a first web site into the handheld Internet appliance, wherein the first web site includes the web site user interface, the web site user interface comprises a button in the first web site, the button comprising a menu displaying menu options for transferring the information from the first web site into the handheld Internet appliance, *the menu options comprising*: an option for saving the information from an already open web site into a local application; and *a plurality of options for launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.”*

In particular, while *Visto* apparently discloses “accessing” information such as emails and calendars, Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* is apparently silent with regard to selecting options for transferring information from a web site.

Furthermore, Applicants have claimed that “the first web site includes the web site user

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

interface for transferring the information from a first web site into the handheld Internet appliance.” Applicants respectfully submit that in *Visto* there is no apparent discussion of a “web site user interface” in the web site from which information is downloaded. Apparently, *Visto* merely discloses that the “Powered – by – Visto platform provides ... websites with a rich suite of integrated communications applications.” (See *Visto* paragraph 9, lines 3 – 5.)

In addition, Applicants have claimed “the *web site user interface comprises a button ... the button comprising* a menu displaying *menu options* ... the menu options *comprising*: an option for saving the information from an already open web site into a local application; and a plurality of *options for launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.*” Applicants respectfully submit that there is no discussion in *Visto* of a menu option for “launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.”

Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose at least the claim limitations discussed hereinabove, and therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 is as follows:

A method for automatically transferring information from a web site displayed on a handheld Internet appliance into a local database in the handheld Internet appliance into a local database in the handheld Internet appliance, the method comprising:

 determining the information to be transferred with a web site application program interface;

 selecting a plurality of options available on a web site user interface for transferring the information from a first web site into the handheld Internet appliance; and

 automatically transferring through operation of a software plug in, the information from the first web site into the local database in the handheld Internet appliance, the transfer performing all necessary format conversions and taking place

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002J060

independent from a synchronization operation, wherein **the software plug-in comprises software routines for:** retrieving the information from the first web site to be saved in the handheld Internet appliance; formatting the information to be saved according to the local database to which the information is going to be transferred; loading the formatted information into the local database in the handheld Internet appliance; **replacing parameters associated with the information on a second web site's URL; automatically launching a second local application from an already open first local application in the handheld Internet appliance; automatically launching a web site from the first local application;** and automatically filling on-line forms of a web site with a data record stored in the local database in the handheld Internet appliance. (Emphasis Added.)

Firstly, Applicants have claimed "selecting a plurality of options ... for transferring information ..." As previously described hereinabove, with regard to independent claim 6, *Visto* apparently fails to disclose selecting options for downloading information. Therefore, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Secondly, Applicants have claimed a "software plug-in" that "comprises software routines for: ... replacing parameters associated with the information on a second web site's URL." Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose the claimed limitation of "replacing parameters associated with the information on a second web site's URL." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Thirdly, Applicants have claimed "software routines for ... automatically launching a second local application from an already open first local application in the handheld Internet appliance; [and] automatically launching a web site from the first local application." Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose both the automatic "launching of a second local application" and the automatic "launching of a web site." While *Visto* discloses that users can get driving directions by simply clicking on a starting and ending address in their address books, there is no apparent indication that a local application and/or a web site is thereby "launched." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 16, 17, 20, 27, and 30

Independent claims 16, 17, 20, 27, and 30 include some common limitations, each of which Applicants believe to be patentable. For the sake of brevity, Applicants will discuss limitations that are common to claims 16, 17, 20, 27, and 30 jointly:

First, claims 16, 17, and 27 include the limitation of “an application program interface *inserted* in the web site for determining the information to be transferred into the handheld Internet appliance,” and claims 20 and 30 include the limitation of “an application program interface *inserted* in a first web site for determining the information to be transferred into the handheld Internet appliance.” While *Visto*, in paragraph 9, lines 3 – 9, apparently discloses that the ‘Powered – by – Visto platform provides ... websites with a rich suite of integrated communications applications,’ *Visto* fails to disclose an application program that determines which information is transferred. Furthermore, assuming arguendo that *Visto* discloses the alleged application program interface, Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose the alleged application program interface is *inserted* in the web site (or the first web site) from which the information is transferred.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 16, 17, 20, 27, and 30 be withdrawn.

Secondly, claims 16, 17, 26, and 27 include at least “a user interface *inserted* in the web site *for selecting a plurality of options* for transferring the information ...” and claims 20 and 30 include at least “a user interface *inserted* in the first web site *for selecting a plurality of options* for transferring the information ...” As previously described hereinabove, with regard to independent claim 6, *Visto* fails to disclose selecting options for downloading information. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* apparently fails to disclose “a user interface *inserted* in the web site for selecting a plurality of options,” as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 16, 17, 20, 26, 27, and 30 be withdrawn.

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

Independent Claims 16 and 26

In addition to the aforementioned limitations, claim 16 includes the limitation of
“the button comprising a menu displaying menu options . . . the menu options comprise: an option for saving the information from an already open web site into a local application; and a plurality of options for launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site,”

and claim 26 includes the limitation of

“the button comprising a menu displaying menu options . . . the menu options comprising: an option for saving the information from an already open web site into a local application; and a plurality of options for launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.”

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no discussion in *Visto* of a menu option for “launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 16 and 26 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 17 and 27

In addition to the aforementioned limitations, claim 17 includes the limitation of
“the option for saving the information from the web site comprises saving an address from the web site into the address book application,”

and claim 27 includes the limitation of

“the option for saving the information from the first web site comprises saving an address from the web site into the address book application.”

Applicants respectfully submit that while *Visto* apparently discloses local applications and address books, *Visto* fails to disclose an option for saving information into address books. Instead, *Visto* merely discloses “synchronization” of contact information. There is no t

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

disclosure regarding whether synchronization is an option or happens by default. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 17 and 27 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 20 And 30

In addition to the aforementioned limitations, claims 20 and 30 include the limitation of “a software plug-in … comprising software routines for: … replacing parameters associated with the information on a second web site's URL.”

Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose the claimed limitation of “replacing parameters associated with the information on a second web site's URL.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 20 and 30 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants have claimed in claim 20

“software routines for … *automatically launching a second local application* from an already open first local application in the handheld Internet appliance; [and] *automatically launching a web site* from the first local application”

and have claimed in claim 30

“software routines for … *automatically launching a second local application* from an already open first local application in the handheld Internet appliance; [and] *automatically launching a web site* from the already open local application.”

Applicants respectfully submit that *Visto* fails to disclose both the automatic “launching of a second local application” and the automatic “launching of a web site.” While *Visto* discloses that users can get driving directions by simply clicking on a starting and ending address in their address books, there is no apparent indication that a local application and/or a web site is thereby “launched.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Docket No. : OS-003C/05002.1060

Independent Claim 26

In addition to the aforementioned limitations, claim 26 includes the limitation of

“the user interface in the web site comprises inserting a button ... the button comprising a menu displaying menu options ... the menu options comprising: an option for saving the information from an already open web site into a local application; and a plurality of options for launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.”

Applicants respectfully submits that there is no discussion in *Visto* of a menu option for “launching a second web site displaying content associated with the information from the already open web site.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 6-8, 10, 16-18, 20, 26-28 and 30 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 804-9080.

Respectfully submitted,


Eric M. Ringer

Eric M. Ringer, Reg. No. 47, 028

Smith Frohwein Tempel Greenlee Blaha LLC
P.O. Box 88148
Atlanta, GA 30346
(770) 804-9080
(770) 804 -0900 (fax)